STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE

GEF ID	11433
Project title	Livestock Support for Climate Change Adaptation and Enhanced Resilience Project (LISCADERP) in Central African Republic
Date of screen	January 26, 2024
STAP Panel Member	Graciela Metternicht
STAP Secretariat	Guadalupe Duron

1. **Summary of STAP's views of the project**

STAP acknowledges the Central African Republic's project, "Livestock support for climate change adaptation and enhanced resilience". The project aims to improve adaptive capacity to climate change by strengthening the enabling environment, and improving farmers' and herders' access to income generating activities through value chains, predominantly focused on livestock systems.

In general, STAP supports the project rationale and the proposed activities. Nonetheless, the project team is encouraged to carefully think about approaches for some of the components, as well as developing the theory of change more robustly so that risks, such as climate change and conflict, are strategically addressed in the project design. Good monitoring and learning also will be necessary to assess the adoption and effects of the types of innovation (e.g., improved technologies for livestock systems, land use plans improving transhumance corridors, financial innovation) on strengthening climate resilience in the eight targeted prefectures. In addition, STAP is moderately concerned by the socio-cultural and political barriers that dictate women's roles and responsibilities in the targeted societies. STAP expects the project to be designed and implemented to robustly account for these barriers. Otherwise, the project's outcomes could be short-lived.

Below, STAP rates its assessment, and provides details of its screening to help improve the project design.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment

☐ Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit

☐ **(X) Minor** - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design

☐ Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. **Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?**

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The project rationale details the climate trends and projections, as well as the socioeconomic characteristics of the Central African Republic (CAR). Detailed information is also provided on the impacts of climate change and adaptive capacity per gender and ethnic group, as well as a description of the cultural values and norms at the household level, and how gender influences these traits. This information is valuable, although STAP would encourage the project team to gather this information for each socioecological system that is being targeted. The information will then be more focused, which could also help reduce the amount of text in the rationale section. (Note: Over 20 pages of text were provided for the rationale, which STAP recommends be written more concisely.).

Besides climate, conflict between communities, ethnic groups, or possibly across countries (e.g., Chad) related to transhumance, is a major driver of change.The rationale section describes this driver, and begins to explore how climate change is affecting seasonal movement of livestock. Greater attention to this relationship is necessary as the project is designed. On baselines, this information appears absent in the rationale, which also would be good to include in the final project document – that is, how this project will leverage knowledge and learning (and possibly financial support) from on-going projects, or past projects.

Given the climate adaptation and environmental problems described in the rationale, the theory of change appears adequate. STAP acknowledges the theory of change narrative (pages 35-37), which provides a preliminary logic on how the project aims to improve livestock systems and the well-being of communities to help them adapt to climate change. Of particular concern to STAP is a comprehensive consideration of the assumptions. For example, the assumptions ignore the socio-cultural barriers and customary laws that can impede the implementation of components 2 and 3. In a society where 75% of women over the age of 15 are illiterate, where the family code gives the husband the exclusive power to manage the family, where resources (including land and income from agriculture and livestock are controlled by men), the current theory of change and approach is destined to fail, or deliver short-term impact, at strengthening climate resilience and adaptive capacity to climate change impacts. The project team should explain better how the activities will be designed and implemented to overcome such significant barriers. Furthermore, the project will be implemented in areas of Indigenous People yet there is no mention of an effort to collate indigenous or traditional knowledge to design interventions that would be socio-culturally and context-based.

 STAP has several recommendations on the project logic, which it details below.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. **Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions**

To strengthen the technical soundness of the project, STAP recommends addressing the following points when designing it:

- The effects of climate change in CAR, as well as in the sites, are discussed at length in the PIF. In addition to climate, STAP recommends describing the influence of population changes, economic instability, and conflict (internal and possibly transboundary). These drivers are touched on in the rationale. However, what would be valuable for describing the various socioecological systems, which are highly specific as suggested in the PIF, is to describe the interactions between these key drivers, and how they are affecting the targeted system, and are likely to influence the outcomes – now and in the future.
- The analysis of key drivers is one of the first steps in helping to develop simple future narratives, which STAP highly encourages the project team to do. These narratives will assist in developing the theory of change by pointing out what is needed to make each pathway, particularly component 2 and 3, resilient to different plausible futures. STAP's guidance on simple future narratives can be accessed here: https://stapgef.org/index.php/resources/advisory-documents/simple-future-narratives-brief-and-primer
- In addition, although the PIF elaborates comprehensively on the climate, environmental, and social (e.g., related to conflict) risks influencing livestock and communities' well-being, these risks do not appear to be embedded in the project logic. These risks (climate, environmental and social) are listed under the risk section, but are 'strategic' risks and need to be embedded in the project logic from the outset. Furthermore, STAP highly encourages the project team to apply the climate information described in the rationale to inform the component development. If it is possible to obtain downscaled data for each of the prefectures, this also would benefit the development of the project.

- STAP recommends specifying further the theory of change. Currently, its status is preliminary, and the diagram would benefit from the addition of components and key outcomes associated with each component. (As mentioned above, STAP is pleased with the theory of change narrative, and appreciates the 'diagrammatic' pathway interpretation.) In addition, suggest detailing the component pathways, especially for components 2 and 3 which have particular risks and assumptions associated with each intervention.
- STAP highly encourages the project team to engage indigenous groups living in the target sites. The project's long lasting impact will depend on co-designing, co-implementing, and co-monitoring activities with indigenous peoples. Currently, the involvement of indigenous groups in these processes is not clear.
- For each of the components, STAP has the following observations:
  - When developing component 1, STAP suggests mapping the relevant policies and regulations, and assessing whether there are conflicts between them. This analysis will help inform the policy alignment which this component seeks to achieve.
  - Please clarify the governance arrangements for managing the transhumance platform. For example, it is unclear who will be consulted to develop the platform, what entity (government, other) will be responsible for hosting the platform and managing its information, and how will beneficiaries be part of decisions on the use of information. Stronger links
  - For component 2, the overall thrust of this component is to integrate agriculture and livestock, as well as help herders improve their livestock systems (e.g., improve breeds so they are better adapted to disease). While STAP agrees with the general premise of this activity, it encourages the project team to specify the agro-silvopastoral system, or different system/approach it plans to encourage farmers and herders to adopt. Currently the description of the crop/livestock system is absent that will be used to improve its management and help strengthen capacity to adapt to climate change.
  - Additionally, in component 2, it is unclear what approach will be used to create and manage a 'transhumance corridor'. This activity lacks detail. For example, who, and how, will stakeholders be engaged in its development, and how will stakeholder conflicting needs be managed? How will trade-offs between different land uses be assessed and managed – for example, using land for the corridor instead of assigning it a different land use? Again, it would strengthen the project if this information was known, or spelled out by describing a proposed approach to design land use plans.
  - For components 2 and 3: component 2 targets 10,000 farmers to be trained in production techniques. With 75% of women (a targeted vulnerable group) illerate; where only 20% of women have access to mobile phones, and only 10% of women have a bank account with mobile services how is the project to deliver a) training that is accessible to women, that women can implement (not being empowered to manage resources according to their cultural norms) and b) how gender-responsive digital financial services will be established that reach and benefit the most needed? The project speaks of developing financial literacy, but that is not enough if women cannot subsequently own decisions and manage funds.
  - Further elaboration of component 2 and 3 is also necessary. For example, it would be valuable to develop these pathways more substantially so that each type of value chain is defined, and their risks and assumptions specified. This will allow for good monitoring and learning; and contribute to the scaling, innovation, transformation, and ultimately, resilience - the project's ambition.
  - For component 3, detailing this pathway, as suggested above, is necessary. This pathway contains novel finance approaches, which STAP in theory supports. Nonetheless, its impact is dependent on mitigating and addressing risk (financial, environmental, social), some of which can be planned for in a strong logic chain; and others, which will arise during implementation and which the project will need to learn from and adapt to improve communities' resilience to climate change and livestock systems.

- When the theory of change is fully developed, STAP recommends identifying outcome indicators to complement the core indicators. Monitoring and assessing change will be necessary for the project to generate knowledge, and adapt as necessary based on this learning. The core indicators are not apt to monitor the change this project seeks to achieve from complex, socioecological and livestock systems. STAP provides guidance on metrics for transformation in this resource, which could be adapted to the project: https://stapgef.org/index.php/resources/advisory-documents/achieving-transformation-through-gef-investments

- STAP is aware of ILRI's "Tracking Adaptation in Livestock Systems" (TAiLS), and encourages the project team to consider this tool to complement the proposed approach. Through its use, perhaps this project could contribute to improving TAiLS, or scaling its use. It is apparent, from a brief desktop search, that there is a dearth of climate adaptation tools for livestock systems. TAiLS can be accessed here: https://www.cgiar.org/news-events/news/tracking-adaptation-in-livestock-systems-tails-tool-spotlighted-at-sbsta-58/

- The project cites youth as one of the target beneficiaries, with little explanation in the theory of change and components on how they will be involved and empowered (beyond mere consultation workshops, or one-off trainings). STAP recommends recent literature that recognizes barriers for youth, as highlighted in this project, and which collects good practices that may work in the socio-cultural, political and economic context of the CAR.   Nchanji, E. B., Kamunye, K., & Ageyo, C. (2023). "Thematic evidencing of youth-empowering interventions in livestock production systems in Sub-Sahara Africa: a systematic review. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 7, 1176652." Excerpt from this resource: "Youth face significant barriers to participating in livestock systems ranging from limited empowerment, limited access to productive assets and land, social-cultural limitations and inadequate youth-focused policy implementation. Despite the hurdles, youths, and other actors are employing various mechanisms to overcome them and enhance their participation in livestock systems. They utilize self-driven approaches such as gifting animals amongst themselves, forming saving groups commonly referred to as merry-go-rounds and belonging to community group formations as a form of social capital to empower themselves mutually. Education is also an empowerment tool for youths in the livestock sector."

- STAP encourages that 'knowledge management and learning' and the holistic approach to capacity building at institutional and individual (women, youth) levels be embedded throughout the proposed project components so that adaptive learning can occur and that learning lessons (including failures) can be appropriately captured and used. STAP notes that only component 3 refers to building literacy of women), and that less than 5% of the funds requested will be devoted to monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and Evaluation need to be part of the KM&L system to ensure that learning occurs and is used to modify actions and interventions during the project lifetime, and to inform other future GEF initiatives that may occur in similar socio-cultural and political contexts.

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant.
Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?

2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives)**, based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?

3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?

4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?

5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".

   - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
   - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
   - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
   - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?

6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?

7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?

8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

   - how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
   - how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
   - how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. Innovation and transformation:
    - If the project is intended to be **innovative:** to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
    - If the project is intended to be **transformative:** how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)